DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 628 RC 014 745

AUTHOR Fried, Robby, Ed.
TITLE Effective Schooling in a Rural Context: A New Hampshire View.
INSTITUTION New Hampshire State Dept. of Education, Concord.; Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc., Chelmsford, MA.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 82
GRANT NIE-G-81-0034
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Boards of Education; Classroom Techniques; Educational Administration; Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Systems; Principals; Rural Education; *Rural Schools; *School Community Relationship; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Automobile Industry; *New Hampshire

ABSTRACT

This series of four essays is designed to share practical, workable strategies for quality rural education. The first essay, Ernest Lohman's "It's About Time...," gives an overview of the effective schooling concept and then looks specifically at ways a classrooom teacher can apply that concept. The essay includes a bibliography. The second essay, Professor Kenneth Heuser's "The Principal's Role and Effectiveness in New Hampshire Schools," examines both actual and perceived effectiveness, and asserts that schools are judged not only by how well they perform, but by how well they are perceived to be doing their job. Charles Ashley's "Six Points Towards Increased Effectiveness in Rural Schools" draws attention to positive steps that school boards can take to improve the quality of rural schools, and suggests that educators capitalize on the familiarity of small town environments to foster conviviality and cooperation in developing and carrying out school policy. The last essay, "Managing Our Schools for Effective Learning," by John Davy and Larry Bramblett, looks to contrasting management styles in the automobile industry--as practiced in Detroit and Japan--as a framework for examining a consensus approach to school management. It invites readers to identify desired results rather than abstract goals for educational systems. (Author/SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 1984
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

Effective Schooling In A Rural Context: A New Hampshire View

ED243628

RC 014745

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

GOVERNOR OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Hugh J. Gallen

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Dist. 1 Raymond Burton, Woodsville
Dist. 2 Malcolm McLane, Concord
Dist. 3 Dudley W. Dudley, Durham
Dist. 4 Louis Georgopoulos, Manchester
Dist. 5 Bernard A. Streeter, Jr., Nashua

NEW HAMPSHIRE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

John S. Holland, *Chairman*, Bedford
Otis Cloud, Lebanon
Shirley Ganem, Wolfeboro
John R. Gothreau, Berlin
Guenter Mathoni, Nashua
Betty Anne Lavallee, Manchester
Edward C. Sweeney, Jr., Keene

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Robert L. Brunelle, Ed.D.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

Neal D. Andrew, Jr., Ph.D.

It is the policy of the New Hampshire State Board of Education and the State Department of Education not to discriminate in their educational programs, activities or employment practices on the basis of race, language, sex, age, or handicapping condition, under the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the 1972 Educational Amendments; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and the Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

© 1982

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING IN A RURAL CONTEXT: A NEW HAMPSHIRE VIEW

#518
Prod. 0002

The Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc. (NEREX), a private not-for-profit corporation, is a service agency that promotes educational equity and improvement. NEREX coordinates resources and sharing of information among the seven states of the Northeast based on an established set of state and regional priorities. Through NEREX, states are able to expand their available resource base and work through regional sharing efforts toward program improvement. The Northeast Regional Exchange is governed by a Board of Directors that includes the seven Chief State School Officers from the Northeast and eight representatives from a wide variety of education constituency groups in the region.

The development of this publication was supported through a subgrant from the Northeast Regional Exchange, which is funded by the National Institute for Education, U.S. Department of Education, under grant number NIE G-81-0034. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect NIE position or policy, and no official endorsement by NIE or ED should be inferred.

Published by the New Hampshire State Department of Education, 410 State House Annex, Concord, NH 03301

Robby Fried, editor

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Ernest E. Lohman, Ed.D., is Professor of Education at Keene State College, Keene, New Hampshire

Kenneth H. Heuser, Ed.D., is Associate Professor of Education at Plymouth State College, Plymouth, New Hampshire

Charles H. Ashley, Ed.D., is Associate Professor of Education at the University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire

John L. Davy, M.Ed., is Director, Unit on Educational Accountability, New Hampshire State Department of Education, Concord, New Hampshire

Larry Bramblett, M.Ed., is Director of Instruction, Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative School District, Jaffrey, New Hampshire

Foreword

The idea of "effective schools" is not new to New Hampshire. Effectiveness, defined as "doing right" by our students in the classroom while also "doing right" by the taxpayers who support the local educational system, is something that New Hampshire citizens have demanded since the creation of the public school system.

As that system has grown more complex, here and elsewhere, notions of how to improve public schools have seemed to become ever more sophisticated, to the point perhaps where a large segment of the public feels it no longer understands what "education" is all about.

"Effective schooling" brings us full circle. Instead of developing more ways of changing our schools *from without* (through new curricula, new technology, new architecture, new specialists, etc.) the researchers have begun to take note of the best we've got *now*—that combination of leadership, sense of purpose, shared goals, expectations for student achievement, orderly atmosphere, time spent on task, and community support—which together define a school that's "doing right" by all involved. The researchers suggest that our schools can do a lot to improve things *from within*—drawing on the experience, good sense, and good will of principals, teachers, students, and community members—resulting in local schools that are, as they say, more "effective."

That idea makes sense to me. In an era of ever more scarce resources for education, we must look to the human and material resources we already have, to improve the quality of education in a manner which makes most effective use of every local tax dollar. Our current state-wide efforts in "staff development" and "accountability," to cite two examples, are based upon such a belief.

It is in this spirit of pragmatic, coordinated self-improvement in education that I offer this series of essays to you. Whether they serve to strengthen your own convictions about your role in education, or to challenge you to look at other possibilities, I trust that the result will promote educational "effectiveness" in the best sense of the word.

Robert L. Brunelle
N.H. Comissioner of Education

Editor's Preface

Much current scholarship on "effective schools" derives from an examination of urban, or urban ghetto, school systems. Much less is available on rural schools, although the need for discovering and sharing practical, workable strategies for quality education amid budgetary constraints is as critical for rural areas as for cities. This collection is designed to help redress that imbalance.

The four essays contained herein complement each other but can be read independently. The first, Ernest Lohman's "It's About Time. . .", gives an overview of the "effective schooling" concept and then looks specifically at ways a classroom teacher can apply that concept. Professor Lohman's bibliography points the reader toward further study.

The second essay, Professor Kenneth Heuser's "The Principal's Role and Effectiveness in New Hampshire Schools," examines both *actual* and *perceived* effectiveness, and asserts that our schools are judged not only by how well they perform, but by how well they are perceived to be doing their job.

Charles Ashley's "Six Points Towards Increased Effectiveness in Rural Schools" draw our attention to positive steps that school boards can take to improve the quality of rural schools. Professor Ashley suggests that we capitalize on the familiarity of small town environments to foster conviviality and cooperation in developing and carrying out school policy.

Lastly, John Davy and Larry Bramblett ask us to step outside the school and look to contrasting styles of management in the automobile industry—as practiced in Detroit and in Japan—as a framework for examining a consensus approach to school management. Their essay, "Managing Our Schools For Effective Learning," invites us to identify desired *results*—rather than abstract goals—for our educational systems, large or small.

What has impressed me in editing these manuscripts is how well they work together, despite the differences in focus and the fact that all four essays were written separately. Such a convergence in itself suggests that "effective schooling" is a concept whose time, in rural as well as urban places, has come.

Robby Fried
N.H. Office of Community Education

IT'S ABOUT TIME. . .

Ernest E. Lohman

The phrase, "It was the best of times. It was the worst of times", first appeared in Charles Dicken's *A Tale of Two Cities* over one hundred years ago. Since then it has been used frequently to describe periods of time throughout history: epochs, decades, a few years, even a day. It's certainly appropriate today to describe American education in that context.

It's the worst of times for American education because it's beset with declining enrollments, declining credibility, and declining sources of funding. At the same time there is increasing pressure to demonstrate its effective use of human and financial resources in meeting the ever-expanding needs and interests of all school age youngsters.

It's the best of times for American education because it is on the precipice of a re-awareness of two important precepts from Socrates and Plato: Know Thyself and The Life Unexamined Is Not Worth Living. Individually, or as a social system, knowing oneself better can be a challenging process, unsettling perhaps but rewarding. Learning what you are and what you value is essential for the viability of any one individual, and certainly for schools and teachers. Through research, the educational experience called schooling can examine its process and behavior and come to know itself better.

Although classroom teachers have historically treated educational research with disdain, research does provide a perspective by which the complex phenomenon of schooling can be viewed. During the past decade we've consolidated research knowledge about how children learn and how teachers teach. New processes and procedures have been developed as a result of continuing research endeavors for providing a better educational opportunity for all youngsters. Some research findings simply reaffirm what we've always believed to be the effective way to work with youngsters, but it's about time we pay attention to research findings regardless of whether they reaffirm what is practiced or reject what is practiced. Although a major criticism of educational research over the years has been that the findings are too inconsistent to be of value, this criticism is becoming less valid. Current educational research information is neither sufficient nor completely conclusive, but it is what we know about school's effectiveness and teacher effectiveness at this point in time, and it's about time to use this information to make teaching and our schools more effective. Two of these research areas worth the attention of both teachers and principals committed to the improvement of schooling are School

TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

CHARACTERISTICS	RESEARCH SOURCE BY AUTHOR
1. Strong leadership by the school principal.	1. Symposium on Effective Schools 2. Austin 3. Benjamin 4. Edmonds
2. A school climate that is orderly, serious, safe and attractive.	1. Symposium on Effective Schools 2. Rutter 3. Edmonds
3. There is a consensus on goals for the school; consensus on clearly understood teaching objectives and priorities assigned to those objectives.	1. Symposium on Effective Schools 2. Austin 3. Rutter 4. Benjamin
4. There is a focus on achievement and high expectations for all students.	1. Symposium on Effective Schools 2. Brookover 3. Rutter 4. Benjamin 5. Edmonds
5. Instructional activities absorb most of the day.	1. Brookover 2. Benjamin 3. Edmonds
6. There is an evaluation system which includes: student progress, the staff, and the school itself.	1. Symposium on Effective Schools 2. Edmonds

An examination of the characteristics in Table I clearly demonstrates that additional resources are not necessary to make schools more effective. What is necessary is a commitment to work toward what the research indicates makes schools more effective. According to recent research there are six characteristics effective schools share in common. They are:

Number 1: Strong Leadership By the Principal. The principal is the key person in setting the tone of the school. Although the principal either makes things happen or allows them to happen, the principal in effective schools is first and foremost and instructional leader who also is a good business manager and administrator. This person spends most of the time paying attention to instructional issues in the school. As Wellish (15) has found, this administrator is concerned with instruction, communicates views about instruction, takes responsibility for decisions relating to instruction, and emphasizes academic standards.

Number 2: A School Climate That Is Orderly, Serious, Safe, and Attractive. There is no way that instruction can occur with any degree of effectiveness in an atmosphere that is not orderly, serious, safe, as well as attractive; and, it is the principal's responsibility to guarantee this to both teachers and students.

Number 3: There Is A Consensus On Goals For The School, Consensus On Clearly Understood Teaching Objectives, and Priorities Assigned To Those Objectives.

As Thoreau wrote, "It is not enough to be busy. The question is: What are we busy about?" Teachers and the principal need to re-examine the role of their school and to establish priorities. Increasingly, the school has attempted to be all things to all people. It's about time the school, each school, set forth publicly its mutually determined, prioritized goals. . .and then spend time teaching toward those goals with a belief that students can and will learn. Clearly, students experience success in school when the school knows its mission, when there is congruence among all in enforcing school standards and policies, and when students have a sense that they are expected to be academically successful.

Number 4: There Is A Focus On Achievement And High Expectations For All Students.

The research has clearly demonstrated that effective teachers expect students to learn, provide a businesslike structure in the classroom toward learning, and use whole group teaching techniques. It's about time teachers stop excusing poor performance and re-establish academic standards. Students need to be taught how to meet standards, not how to be excused from meeting them. Instructionally, there is no clear evidence to support the sentimental belief that individualized

instruction and independent learning is superior to whole group instruction.

Number 5: Instructional Activities Absorb Most Of The Day.
It's about time that teachers and the principal cooperatively work toward the commitment of students acquiring basic academic skills. Research clearly shows that student achievement results from time spent directly and efficiently on teaching academic skills. Although a warm, human emotional relationship is nice, it is time-on-task that is related to achievement. Many things in the classroom are nice: free time, worksheets to keep students busy, playing a game. These may entertain, but they are not related to achievement. In the effective school there is an instructional emphasis which is enforced, even at the expense of some affective dimensions of the school. Just one example of recent classroom time research is that done by Hiatt (7) in which she concluded that primary teachers devote approximately 20% of morning classtime to instruction. . .half of this on reading, followed by language arts and math. All other subject-matter areas account for less than 4 minutes of instruction during an average morning. Two obvious questions arise from this research: Is the afternoon any different? Is it any different at other grade levels? Be that as it may, it's about time teachers re-examine and assess how much instructional time *each* student does receive.

Number 6: There Is An Evaluation System Which Includes: Student Progress, The Staff, And The School Itself.
In instructionally effective schools there is frequent testing of student progress; however, the results are not only used as a means of determining what a youngster knows, but the results are also used in a diagnostic-prescriptive cycle to assist the teacher in knowing what to re-teach so that both the student and the teacher can be more successful. Effective schools also evaluate each staff member and evaluate the success of the school itself to determine what needs to be done better. To do this, of course, the school and the teacher must both have a set of clear purposes.

These six characteristics of an effective school are not remarkably new. They are, however, based upon many sources of independent research with similar conclusions. Most importantly, every characteristic is within the control of every principal and teacher to achieve. No additional resources are necessary. Only a commitment to be more instructionally effective is necessary. So, it's about time to use the research findings to be more instructionally effective.

As School Effectiveness Research has indicated, the teacher and instruction are unquestionably related to achievement. Because the teacher is the key person in setting the tone in the classroom, Teacher

Effectiveness Research is an essential consideration in making schools more effective. Research about teacher effectiveness has been conducted for many years, but early findings were not consistent. However, as with School Effectiveness Research, recent findings have been more consistent; and it's about time to consider the Teacher Effectiveness Research results as well as the School Effectiveness Research.

Teacher Effectiveness Research can be viewed in three cycles. The first cycle focused on identifying teacher characteristics which produced significant gains in student achievement. As said before, findings from this research were inconsistent and lacking in meaning and usefulness to teachers. The second cycle began in the 1950's and focused on relationships between teacher behavior and pupil learning. Results of these studies, reported by Rosenshine and Furst (12), in the early 1970's, identified five teacher behaviors which correlated with increased learning:

- *clarity of teacher presentation*
- *use of varied activities during the lesson*
- *teacher enthusiasm*
- *businesslike and task-oriented behaviors*
- *student opportunity to learn the material*

Less conclusive results were obtained about the following four teacher behaviors being correlated with increased pupil learning:

- *teacher use of student ideas during discussion*
- *criticism (negatively related to achievement)*
- *use of varied types of questions*
- *teacher's probing of student responses*

Teachers, however, paid little attention to the research findings. Now, in a recent review of process-product research Rosenshine (11) discussed what has been learned about several of these variables. Clarity of presentation, enthusiasm, and use of student ideas are no longer significant predictors of student achievement because today's students in the elementary school spend 50 to 70 percent of their time working alone. It was found that the amount of content covered in the classroom (student opportunity to learn the material) and the businesslike attitude of teachers has continued to yield excellent results. Criticism of students continues to be negatively correlated with achievement.

In another review of recent process-product research, Medley (9) summarized the findings from 14 studies of elementary teachers whose classes showed high means gains on achievement tests in arithmetic, reading, or both. The results of the research indicated that effective teachers:

- *devote more time to academic activities (are task oriented).*
- *spend more time with large groups and less with small groups.*

- *individualize assignments more.*
- *ask more questions classifiable in the lower levels of the Bloom taxonomy.*
- *use more praise or positive motivation.*
- *control the classroom with less criticism and use a more varied repertory of techniques in doing so.*
- *spend more time checking pupils' work during seatwork periods.*
- *spend less class time discussing matters unrelated to lesson content.*

The third cycle of process-product research is now in progress. The emphasis of this research cycle is on the student's mastery of content and the number of minutes the student is attending to academically relevant tasks. The results of these studies thus far reveal a clear and consistent pattern:

- *Effective teachers place students in contact with curriculum materials and keep them actively engaged with the material.*
- *Effective teachers place students in groups and actively supervise the groups rather than let the children work individually on their own. Research by Robert and Ruth Soar has shown that when students work in adult-supervised groups, there are significant achievement gains. (14)*
- *Effective teachers structure the classroom and select the activities.*
- *Effective teachers tend to ask questions that have specific answers.*

The results of these two reviews of recent research studies dealing with teacher effectiveness are similar to findings of School Effectiveness Research. Therefore, to promote greater achievement and to be more effective in the classroom, teachers need to use the research findings in their classroom simply because it's the best of what is known about the teaching/learning process at the present time. To be more effective, teachers should:

1. *Set high academic expectations for all students.*
2. *Teach for mastery. Have students do the activity until they're successful.*
3. *Praise and reward students for* ***demonstrated*** *achievement in academic subjects.*
4. *Have students spend more time on academic activities and less time on independent work and "free time."*
5. *Give youngsters an opportunity to learn the material and individualize assignments.*
6. *Spend more time with large groups and less time with small groups. [1]"The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study," a large government-financed research project, found that students working with a teacher were clearly off-task only 4-6% of the time. When they were working without teacher supervision, they were off-task 16% of the time and used another 10% of their time moving from one activity to another.*
7. *Spend time checking pupil's work during seatwork periods.*
8. *Be businesslike in the classroom.*
9. *Ask more questions which have specific answers.*
10. *Test pupil understanding frequently.*

[1]*Discussed in Barak Rosenshine, "Content, Time, and Direct Instruction," in* ***Research On Teaching,*** *p. 42.*

11. *When directly teaching students, be enthusiastic, strive toward clarity of explanations and presentations, and use student ideas but concentrate on correct answers.*

In 1978 the RAND study (3) dealing with educational change stated the following as one of its conclusions:

> *. . .a primary motivation for teachers to undertake the extra work and disruption of attempting change is the belief that they will become better teachers and that their students will benefit. (p.25)*

No extra work or disruption is necessary to become more instructionally effective or to help students achieve and be more successful in school. Only a commitment to work at using research findings in the classroom is necessary.

If any teacher or school is to become more effective, two things must happen. First, it's about time to read, or re-read, *The Little Engine That Could* and to believe "I think I can, I know I can" become more effective. Secondly, it's about time to put the Teacher Effectiveness Research and the School Effectiveness Research into practice. It's about time to use the best of what we know to help students be more successful in school; because, contrary to the Coleman Report, research studies are finding and reaffirming that effective teachers and effective schools *do* make a difference. It's about time. . .

Bibliography

1. Austin, G. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness." **Educational Leadership.** 1979, 10-14.
2. Benjamin, R. "Towards Effective Urban Schools: A National Study." In D. Brundage (Ed.) **The Journalism Research Fellows Report: What Makes An Effective School?"** Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1979.
3. Berman, Paul and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. **Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations.** Santa Monica, California: RAND CORPORATION. May, 1978.
4. Brookover, W. **School Social Systems and Student Achievement. Schools Can Make A Difference.** New York: Draeger. 1979.
5. Coleman, J. S. **et. al. Equality of Educational Opportunity.** Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
6. Edmonds, Ronald. "Some Schools Work and More Can." **Education.** 80-81, pp. 39-42.
7. Hiatt, Diana B. "Time Allocation in the Classroom: Is Instruction Being Shortchanged?" **Phi Delta Kappan.** December, 1979. 289-290.
8. Medley, Donald M. "Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness: A Review of Process-Product Research." Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. 1977.
9. Medley, Donald M. "The Effectiveness of Teachers." In Penelope L. Peterson and Herbert J. Wallberg (Eds.) **Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications.** Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan, 1979.
10. Report on Symposium on Effective Schools. National Committee for Citizens in Education. Columbia, Maryland. June, 1980.
11. Rosenshine, Barak U. "Content, Time, and Direct Instruction," In Penelope L. Peterson and Herbert J. Walberg (Eds.), **Research on Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications.** Berkeley, CA. McCutchan, 1979.
12. Rosenshine, Barak, and Norma Furst. "Research on Teacher Performance Criteria." In B. Othanel Smith (Ed.), **Research In Teacher Education: A Symposium.** Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
13. Rutter, M. **et. al. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children.** Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
14. Soar, Robert and Ruth Soar. "Direct Instruction Reconsidered." In Penelope L. Peterson and Herbert J. Walberg (Eds.), **Research On Teaching: Concepts, Findings, and Implications.** Berkeley, CA., McCutchan, 1979.
15. Wellish, J. B. **et. al.** "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools." **Sociology of Education.** 1978, **51,** 211-226.

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE AND EFFECTIVENESS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOLS

by Kenneth Heuser

If it's true that "all the world's a stage," it is equally true that human beings, in their quest for security, try to identify the players as quickly as possible. And while we prefer to think of ourselves as critics like Gene Shalit, possessing considerable and deep insight into characterization, all too often we resort to a more shallow way of identifying called "labeling."

Here in the educational drama, professionals and lay citizens alike label freely, despite the shoddiness of that practice. Children are made to suffer because a teacher considers the student "slow" or a parent acknowledges that "he has always been a problem." Similarly, schools which develop identities and personalities can also be adversely affected by the psychological process of labeling.

When seeking out opinions about effective schools in New Hampshire, one discovers how widespread labeling is, even when it superficially benefits those schools which have won or earned a good reputation. Broken Ground School in Concord, for example, is often cited in academic circles as a good site for visitation, and it is likely that the presence of visitors is sometimes a boost to staff morale.

While some schools benefit from the positive aura that surrounds them, others are less fortunate, and they find themselves with an "identity crisis" where, like Rodney Dangerfield, they "can't get no respect." The most damaging aspect of the labels schools carry is that they are often not fairly or objectively assigned. I am thinking of two adjacent towns I know of: one has a clearly positive image and one a vaguely negative image. Yet from my perspective as an unbiased observer, there is little difference in their actual effectiveness; in some ways the latter has an edge over the former.

Let me define three key terms, "effectiveness", "actual effectiveness" and "perceived effectiveness." *Effectiveness* is not a new word; as applied to schools it simply means a school which is doing what it sets out to do. The term has taken on significance recently among those who see it as a term connoting basic measurability of how well a school is functioning as an organization. It is related to phrases such as "cost effective", "human resource management", "quality control", "operations research", and the like. While such terminology grows out

of business and industry with its product orientation, the terminology can be a tool for those who examine the school as a complex organization.

As we look at "actual effectiveness", we must consider three subcategories: cost effectiveness, process effectiveness, and product-related effectiveness. *Cost effectiveness* is the result of responsible stewardship of material and non-material resources. School people and taxpayers alike want to know: "In relationship to the goals we have set for our schools, are we making the best use of our New Hampshire tax dollars?" Cost effectiveness requires planning, not simply Yankee penny-pinching. Tax dollars are the most computable resources of a school, but there are so many other resources to consider in terms of cost-effectiveness. Related questions might be:

Is the school making best use of the talents of its staff, its students, its skilled and knowledgeable community persons?
As we review our inventory, are there creative uses for forgotten materials?
How can our facilities be put to better use?

I would also like to suggest we add up the cost or price of a host of school management decisions:

What price will we pay if we eliminate this program?
Or change this policy? Or deny this request?
What price have New Hampshire schools had to pay as a result of adversary teacher negotiations?

Process effectiveness is of great importance in our New Hampshire schools. Business generally points to product when quality is discussed; education is more concerned with the quality of experiences which the school provides. A few relevant questions include:

Is the planning process a vital part of the school?
Is commitment to goals being generated by good broad-based involvement in the goal-setting and decision-making processes?
Are human dignity and worth maintained by school processes?
Do administrative practices conform to democratic processes?
Is evaluation considered a natural process in the school?
Is there reward for appropriate behavior of all those involved with the school?

Product-related effectiveness is akin to business' "quality control"; but in education the product is more difficult to measure. The products of our schools are not the students; the products are student achievement and the learning environment. Therefore quality control measures are meant to bring about maximum student achievement and improved school climate. Related issues include:

Does the curriculum motivate students to achieve?
Do curricular and extra-curricular activities contribute to a positive school climate?
Do school policies and practices contribute to improved school-wide morale?

Is the learning process a natural outgrowth of a concerted effort to improve student self-concept?

It would be absurd to imply that "actual effectiveness" is not the goal of a school, but "*perceived effectiveness*" is also crucial. Perceived effectiveness describes the dominant collective attitude toward the school, and the perceptions we are dealing with are those of the public at large and the media. (By definition, the views of school personnel are part of a school's actual effectiveness and are related to climate and morale.) Several factors can contribute to a school's perceived effectiveness such as stereotyping, the physical appearance, informal communication patterns, and media coverage.

Typecasting occurs when a school loses its multidimensional character and takes on a flat image which becomes firmly entrenched in the public mind. In the entertainment world, typecasting is considered undesirable. Henry Winkler's success as the Fonz has been a mixed blessing; while his recognizability is at a high level, his adaptability is proportionately reduced. He differs from an actor such as Jack Lemmon whose versatility has been established through a balance of dramatic and comedy roles.

A school may be typecast as "effective" or "ineffective", or as "a good school for the college bound student" or "a school with a militant staff", and so forth. Even a postive image can be debilitating if such a stereotype limits a school's options for positive growth or change because the public cannot see beyond its typecast image.

In New Hampshire, stereotypes form quickly. If a school has an open-campus policy, surely student discipline must be "lax." If the school stresses its vocational program, the curriculum must be "relevant." If mini-courses are available, "the basics" probably aren't being addressed. If there are no walls between teaching areas, the school must be too noisy and the school's philosophy too "liberal." If computers are being used, the curriculum must be "future-oriented."

In addition to typecasting, many *cosmetic aspects* of the school cause favorable or unfavorable public relations. A clean school is effective; a dirty school ineffective. Well-organized materials contribute to a feeling of effectiveness. Coordinated colors may symbolize effectiveness; unnecessarily bright colors may create a mood of ineffectiveness. Neatly attired teachers and students, graffiti-free corridors, the lack of cigarette butts in entry areas, all contribute to perceived effectiveness.

Informal communication patterns reinforce public attitudes toward the school. For example, the support staff of custodians, secretaries, cooks, bus drivers and others is an important part of perceived effectiveness. When support staff do not have a clear understanding of the

goals and curriculum of the school, inappropriate and damaging comments to friends and neighbors can contribute to perceived ineffectiveness. The public often views the support staff as "real people," unlike teachers and administrators who have a vested interest in image making.

Media coverage, especially press coverage, can contribute to positive or negative feelings toward the school. Unfortunately in New Hampshire, there are several newspapers which consider it their responsibility to generate unfavorable publicity about schools at precisely the worst times. While the public often takes negative coverage with a "grain of salt," the cumulative effect of continuous bad press can wear at the positive attitudes of all but the most avid school supporters. On the other hand, good press can help cement the perception of effectiveness which the school seeks.

The relationship between actual and perceived effectiveness is not direct; a simple matrix illustrates at least four statements of effectiveness which may characterize a given school:

	perceived as effective	perceived as ineffective
actually effective	TYPE A SCHOOL	TYPE B SCHOOL
actually ineffective	TYPE C SCHOOL	TYPE D SCHOOL

The lines between the boxes need to be drawn darkly since movement from box to box is not easy.

When I've asked principals to rank order these four options in terms of desirability, Type A is ranked first, Type D is ranked last, but a real dilemma occurs as the principals try to rank options B and C. The crux of their "problem" centers around the politics of New Hampshire and our specific pattern of school financing. While principals (and other school personnel) want effective schools, they know the importance of positive public opinion at school, town, and municipal meetings.

The distinction which has been drawn between actual and perceived effectiveness brings with it some implications for the role of the principal and the school. Based on my observations of New Hampshire

schools for more than a decade, I would make the following suggestions to principals.

In relation to *actual effectiveness:*

1. The principal as a member of the administrative team should place greater emphasis on long-range planning. Long-range planning is often neglected because pressing day to day problems are distracting. Yet in order to move toward actual effectiveness, these and other long-range planning tasks must be accomplished: relating yearly program-based budget allocations to program and school goals; developing a *set* of five year plans or scenarios which anticipate and address some of the more likely contingencies; helping school boards write policies which anticipate and offset crisis decisions; determining where the school is going and at what checkpoints the progress should be measured; creating an evaluation network where individuals have long-range responsibilities for evaluating and improving programs.

2. The principal should try to build greater commitment to school goals. Change is not intrinsically good or bad; only when the change is held up against the template of school goals can the change be evaluated. A greater commitment to goals can help the staff evaluate change and speed its implementation. In addition, a greater involvement of community people in the school can increase their awareness and commitment to goals while at the same time improving the learning environment.

3. The principal should be an advocate of the team concept. The "team" organizational pattern has great potential for revitalizing the teaching profession. A good number of New Hampshire schools have found that the interaction of creative teachers who have been given responsibility can work to motivate teachers and, in turn, the students. In my opinion, education would benefit from a redefinition of management to include the *teacher,* since the teacher is a manager of key processes in the learning environment which relate to the success of the total organization. Think how much more effective our schools would be if every teacher thought of him/herself as a manager of the resources which individual children, curriculum materials, and community persons represent, instead of as a "mere employee" of the school system. A principal need not give up administrative authority in order to increase the positive effects of team effort.

4. The principal can contribute to effectiveness by more deliberately tying together staff evaluation and staff development. The school's goals come to life through the skills of creative teachers. Therefore individual staff development plans must reflect the teacher's willingness to develop a teaching style which, for that person, best represents commitment to school goals.

5. The principal must creatively devise techniques to reinforce teachers. The teacher's phychological well-being is often neglected: "burn-out" is due as much to the lack of a feeling of appreciation as it is to job stress. Sincere recognition, shared responsibility, and the freedom to be inventive are among the best alternatives open to principals.

In relation to *perceived effectiveness:*

1. The principal should assign a staff member who relates well to reporters and editors to be a liaison between the school and the media. The responsibility for generating favorable publicity at the right time ought to be in the hands of someone who has time to give it ample attention. If this person is a teacher, some released time from teaching might be considered.

2. The principal should develop a more comprehensive approach to orientation. Orientation should not be thought of as a one day practices-and-policy review. For a new teacher, orientation is really a year-long process which begins with the first letter a person receives from the school; through a familiarization with the school's setting, policies, procedures; an introduction to the school's evaluation process; to an end of the year summary discussion. The purpose of orientation is to create an awareness of the school's purpose and to build "team" spirit. It is critical that the comprehensive orientation plan include support staff so that they feel part of the team and understand the overall process of the school and its programs.

3. The principal should fight stereotyping by taking frequent opportunity to highlight a variety of school programs. As an example, while it might intimidate opponents to know that they're up against a school which is recognized for its athletics, it would best serve the school to emphasize other aspects of the program in the media and at service club meetings.

4. The principal should hire support staff who relate well to the public. There is nothing more humiliating for visitors than to be treated as unwanted guests by a secretary who refuses to look up and recognize their presence.

5. The principal should not rely on the open-door policy to show that he or she believes in staff and community involvement. Proactive effort is needed to demonstrate to the staff and the public that their opinions are valued.

6. The principal should tour the building with one or two individuals who are particularly critical of the school's appearance and operation. Careful notetaking during a tour of this type may point out some of the features of the school which are contributing to perceived ineffectiveness.

7. The principal should take every opportunity to make community

members feel part of the "in-group" which supports the school. The terminology of "in-group" and "out-group" is very relevant to any discussion of perceived effectiveness. It is my opinion that those individuals who consider themselves as part of the out-group in respect to the school are the most likely to feel that the school is ineffective. This group can be characterized by such phrases as "disenfranchised from" or "uninvolved in" the school. The in-group on the other hand feels that they are in the mainstream of activity surrounding the school.

Part of the remedy for perceived ineffectiveness therefore lies in the application of the in-group, out-group terminology to the management of the school; more individuals need to feel that they are part of the in-group. Coffee sessions which feature interaction between citizens and staff would be useful; the presence of meaningful volunteerism is appropriate. The staff needs training to help them be attentive to the psychological needs of the public.

The ultimate test of perceived effectiveness is the ability of all school personnel, including students, to relate in a pleasant, informed way to everyone who has contact with the school.

Each person is at some level asking the question, "What do *I* gain from seeing this school as effective, or as ineffective?" The parent whose child is doing poorly academically may have a hidden motivation to think of the school as ineffective. A citizen whose neighbors have a low regard for the school, may feel peer pressure to adopt similar negative attitudes. On the other hand, a business man whose self-esteem is enhanced by contributing to a child's "career awareness," is similarly motivated to think of the school as effective since his contribution is thereby all the more valuable.

These suggestions are meant to help principals bring about both actual and perceived effectiveness. *Actual* effectiveness is the real job of New Hampshire schools, but the political climate of our state demands attention to *perceived* effectiveness also. After all, while we all know that "one can't judge a book by its cover," the enticing and provocative covers of books on sale from Berlin to Bedford show us that publishers have learned that the cover is precisely what motivates most of us to look inside.

SIX POINTS TOWARD INCREASED EFFECTIVENESS IN RURAL SCHOOLS

by Charles H. Ashley

The author, notwithstanding degrees from Dartmouth, the University of New Hampshire, Boston University, and Oxford, England, is probably better known in his home state for having been born and raised in Woodsville, New Hampshire, which by most definitions is rural. I think it is important that we who live in a rural setting in a rural state retain our objectivity about it and, above all, not be defensive concerning the word or the life style.

A recent survey by the Becker Research Corporation of Boston stated that 60% of its residents consider New Hampshire one of the best or an above-average place to live.[1] Alvin Toffler, who has earned some kind of reputation as a forecaster of life—present and future—tells us that while rural folks are different, these differences are not necessarily negative.[2]

Defensiveness, however, is a common behavior in educators, and in fact borders on paranoia in many of us. It comes from over 300 years of criticism of the quality of public schools in America. This defensiveness deprives us of energy and enthusiasm that might be put to the task of improving ourselves and our schools. ***Point One in improving the quality of schools in New Hampshire is not to be defensive and to retain objectivity about our school systems.***

Perceived reality is often not objective reality! Point two has to do specifically with the behaviors of school board members and their executive officer, the superintendent of schools. It is critically important that school board members be fully informed as to the direct consequences of their policy-setting actions. They must literally *see* the consequences of their actions, and that means visiting the schools themselves.

In New Hampshire, we take great pride in separating powers. We do not wish the Federal Government to interfere in our state, nor the state in our community! Unfortuantely, in education this leads to the common view that school principals are in charge of school buildings, superintendents provide overall leadership and policy implementation, while school board members make policy and then stay away. This is unnecessary.

Point Two is to have school board members visit the schools on a regularly-planned basis, at the invitation of the superintendent and principal, and view directly the implementation of their policies, as demonstrated by the daily classroom behavior of the community's youth. Of course, such planned visits do not mean that board members should interfere with the daily management of the school.

Through such visitations, school board members will have a chance to see for themselves what this thing called "public education" really is and how to more knowledgeably explain and defend the educational program to the public at large. These visits could contribute much to solid decision-making and policy-setting at regular school board meetings.

Superintendents may react with skepticism to this suggestion because it calls for a more visible and more active role on the part of the school board members, as well as a different form of executive leadership on the part of the superintendent. However, the net effect of such an effort might be to remove the superintendent from the increasingly common *adversary* position with respect to the local board. Such a position results from the superintendent being forced to explain/defend programs, and this makes it very difficult for the two sides to then function properly.

Regular school visits by the board open lines of communication, reduce areas of tension, reduce defensiveness on the part of school administrators, and reduce aggressiveness on the part of board members who, while they genuinely care about the schools, often do not know how to translate this caring into a constructive dialogue with those responsible for running the schools.

The U.S. Secretary of Education, in a recent message to the Education Commission of the States,[3] declared that a weakness of local school boards was not setting standards of learning, and urged them to prescribe *maximum* competencies, not minimum competencies. He argued that when performance is measured, performance improves. He stated that we cannot have quality education without quality teaching, and complained that we do not give our teachers enough recognition or monetary reward.

If these contentions are true, there are many ways aside from salary considerations that school boards can recognize teachers and improve their perstige in the community, especially in a state like New Hampshire, where teachers are such a visible part of every community.

One form of teacher recognition which does not cost money is

involving them in defining goals, creating objectives, and setting priorities within the school system, using consensus as a method. Consensus, a much misunderstood word, provides the opportunity for all to participate in decision-making; consensus does not mean unanimity!

Most of us do not have "consensus skills" as part of our leadership experience and training, and the lack of such skills keeps us from initiating shared decision-making with parents, principals, students, teachers, etc., as advocated by researchers on effective schools.[4] We could learn a lesson from our neighbors in Maine, who run summer institutes sponsored by the principal's association, State Department of Education, and the University of Maine, where they train the principals in these and other skills. The evidence is overwhelming that "effective schools are characterized by effective leadership and the principals, superintendents, and board members are the fulcrum of those activities."[5] Inclusion of school board members in such institutes would further extend such consensus-seeking practices.

New Hampshire is the second fastest growing state east of the Mississippi; this means we have many adults who come in from elsewhere and, after comparing New Hampshire schools with those in the communities they came from are quick to ask: "why aren't we doing that here?"

What we do *here* should be the result of carefully-developed goals on exactly what it is we and the schools can do for our children in our communities. Dialogue between school boards and new residents can have the doubly beneficial effect of involving the energies of newcomers in contributing their skills to the schools (as school volunteers, etc.), while avoiding conflicts between newcomers and old-timers.

It is the role of the superintendent to articulate a broad view of education related to the needs of the society as a whole, and it is the obligation of the local board to make certain that the goals, and practices of local schools reflect the community. Thus, the board and superintendent and other key educators in the system must learn to function as a *problem-solving unit*, rather than as a stratified layer of narrowly-focused groups with built-in adversary positions. ***Point Three calls for creation of a genuine partnership in the community for educational decision-making.***

In rural education, in particular, there is every reason to have wider community involvement. Wilden's study[6] states that the destiny of the community is best resolved by a wider involvement of all in goal-setting, and urges the schools to be open for community participation in this regard. He has no quarrel with the idea that professional educators should be given the responsibility of implementing the goals, but suggests that local board members attempt to involve more parents

and other citizens so that the resulting partnerships can play a significant role in helping the community to work with the school. Citizens' advisory groups are not new in the history of education, nor are school volunteer programs. What would be "new" would be to see local school boards take the initiative in helping to sponsor such groups, rather than to feel "invaded" by them.

Community partnerships represent a sensitive administrative issue, and such efforts take a great deal of time and effort. But when one involves all who are affected in analyzing problems and considering means to solve them, one often gains a greater commitment from all affected. Thus, to ignore these resources in a community is to ignore talent, energies, and resources for constructive changes in the school systems which will have the backing of newcomers and old-timers, parents and non-parents, professionals and lay-citizens alike.

It has been said that in decision-making the approach often becomes as important as the decision rendered. School Board members and administrators who do not take the time to include other people in the decision-making process are often surprised when seemingly worthwhile decisions are rendered ineffective because of the process. Hoy and Miskel[7] stress the critical importance of *preparation* in decision-making, and point out that those principals who spend more time laying the ground work with faculty and others tend to have better results with their decisions.

Much of the literature on effective schools portrays the principal as being directly responsible for the quality of education. The principal should model correct behavior, set standards, involve teachers, parents and pupils, while demonstrating academic results! Here again, school board members and superintendents must ask themselves: If the principal's role is critical, is that person centrally involved in board meetings?

Point Four is to have the principals at board meetings, primarily as sources of first-hand information about the schools they are responsible for. This will continue to open up communication lines and further reduce tension between the board and its key administrators.

Neale, Bailey and Ross[8] document a strong relationship between the building principal and the behavior of the school as an organization. The literature on organizations contains literally hundreds of selected works on change and organizational development.[9] Most of the models or schemes described draw upon the principal, superintendent, and board as the key people in accomplishing any educational change.

In rural settings particularly, the people who are crucial for quality education are the principal and the classroom teachers. four of the most successful models of change—Ronald G. Havelock's "Linkage Model," Richard A. Schmuck's "Organizational Development in Schools," John I. Goodlad's "Responsive Model of Education Improvement," and the Rand "Change Agent Study Model"[10]—contain a common ingredient for successful educational change. That ingredient is collaboration among all members of the educational community, including students, parents, administrators, college educators, and state education officials.

According to Squires[11] there can be little substantial change without effective communication and effective process! It is all too common in a rural setting for a person in a position of authority to tell someone else what to do. Such a direct reliance upon authority is necessary at times, but when practiced as the sole or main style of leadership, the "telling" process often breeds resentment and alienation. An absence of leadership options can be needlessly devastating to rural schools. Guthrie and Miller talk about powerless "ins" and powerless "outs" as compared to powerful "ins."[12] I don't have to tell you that the powerful "ins" are most commonly seen as board members, superintendents, and principals, and that teachers often see themselves as powerless "ins." Powerless "outs," on the other hand, such as parents and other adults, feel they do not have access to decisions that affect their children or their pocketbooks. Often such adults choose not to be involved in school decisions. Sometimes they are excluded by administrative design or tradition. This isolation of powerless "outs" in a rural setting weakens the base of support for public education, as may be seen by yearly efforts to cut school budgets.

Point Five is at once the easiest and most difficult of steps; one should consider analyzing the vocabulary of key people in the system. If the working daily vocabulary of key administrators, board members, or teachers is primarily *negative,* towards education in general or students in particular, such attitudes have as much to do with setting the tone as do the academic decisions being rendered. Measuring the positive or negative aspects of one's daily speech habits is not an expensive or difficult task. Anyone can do it who is sensitive to it.

If whenever the school board is meeting or administrators or teachers are talking, the conversation is filled with blaming, antagonism, or cynicism, we need look no further for an explanation of why schools are in trouble all over this nation. Examining the tone of our language is not just a simplistic exercise. It may provide solid clues to pervasive educational problems.

Rural schools should reflect the needs of the community as well as the dreams and aspirations of rural youth. Students and their parents must share in the task of setting priorities and goals for their schools but so also should the disenfranchised others—those without children who pay taxes just the same.

The last point, ***Point Six,*** has to do with conflict. ***Conflict resolution skills are all too often lacking in educational settings.*** We teach diplomats and military professionals those critical skills, but somehow assume educators will automatically solve things in a calm, rational manner. Educational conflict is seldom rational, and the facts are seldom clear.

The traditional ways of dealing with conflicts in rural schools are little different from those in other settings. Denial or withdrawal is common, and the suppression or smoothing over of disputes often appears to be the quickest or easiest solution. Negotiation over teacher contracts, for example, is entangled with issues of power and dominance, and threats or intimidation are common weapons in settling difficulties. Rarely used is the collaborative approach, which recognizes that conflict is a necessary organizational force which doesn't have to lead to mutual antagonism. Conflict is not seen as healthy, and the parties in the conflict usually don't recognize the ability and the expertise of the other.[13] Conflict is often an important part of decision-making, and educators of all kinds need to learn to respond to it creatively.

A simple solution in conflict resolution is reducing defensive leadership. The following quotation is a more sophisticated version of what has been advocated throughout this article but is no less workable.

> *It seems to me equally clear that defensive leadership is highly inappropriate and perhaps even fundamentally dissonant with another viable side of the world we live in: with education for growth, intimacy, authenticity, humanness, and creativity; with the Judeo-Christian ethics of love, honesty, intimacy, faith, cheek-turning, and brotherhood; with a climate of research, inquiry, scholarship, contemplation, and learning; with cooperation, group planning, team building, and various successful forms of group effort; with the new emerging models of industrial organization and manufacturing productivity; with what might be thought of as the behavioral science approach to organizational change; with the world of ambiguity, feeling, conflict, sorrow, creativity, and diversity; with many new and exciting developments in education, architecture, the creative arts, economics, management, and all phases of modern life; in short, with the world of human beings, with people.*[14]

At times, frustrated educators and school board members must wonder whether effective school leadership is not like good weather—a condition everyone wants but no one really knows how to produce. To carry the analogy further, just as people may disagree about what

constitutes "good weather," so, too, effective school leadership can mean different things to different people.

Effective schools can provide a better life for students and taxpayers in all types of communities, without costing any more money. But we must take a careful look at the processes affecting our daily behavior and the decisions we make. The six points outlined herein can help get any community off to a good start.

REFERENCES

[1]***Boston Sunday Globe,*** February 28, 1982, p. 64.

[2]Alvin Toffler. ***The Third Wave*** (New York: William Morrow & Co., Inc., 1980), pp. 68-69.

[3]Center for Educational Field Services ***Newsletter,*** September 4, 1981.

[4]***Ingredients for Effective Schools*** (Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education, June 1980).

[5]Gordon D. Donaldson. "R_X for School Leadership: The Maine Principals' Academy," ***Phi Delta Kappan*** February 1982. 400-401

[6]Daniel C. Neale, William J. Bailey, and Billy E. Ross. ***Strategies for School Improvement: Cooperative Planning and Organizational Development*** (Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981).

[7]Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel. ***Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice,*** 2nd edition (New York: Random House, 1982).

[8]Daniel C. Neale, William J. Bailey and Billy E. Ross. ***Strategies for School Improvement.***

[9]Ronald G. Havelock. ***A Guide to Innovation in Education.*** (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1970).

[10]Daniel C. Neale, William J. Bailey and Billy E. Ross. ***Strategies for School Improvement.***

[11]David A. Squires. "Characteristics of Effective Schools: the Importance of School Processes" (mimeographed).

[12]Eileen Guthrie and Sam Miller. ***Making Change*** (Minneapolis, MN: Consultants for Community Development, 1977).

[13]William R. Lassey (Ed.). ***Leadership and Social Change*** (Iowa City, IA: University Associates, Publishers and Consultants).

[14]William R. Lassey. ***Leadership and Social Change.***

MANAGING OUR SCHOOLS FOR EFFECTIVE LEARNING

by John Davy and Larry Bramblett

Darby is a mythical New Hampshire town frequently referred to by writers, natives, L. L. Bean types, and refugees from Massachusetts as the composite New England Village. It could have been the town Grace Metallius lived in or the more endearing village, "Our Town." But since these names conjure up familiar images, we are back to the quaint little village nestled down at the foot of a mountain with the late afternoon sun reflecting off the church steeple and the Paul Revere Bell. We'll just call it Darby.

When the sun goes down in late February the people of Darby do what people do in most small towns across America. They watch the evening news and read the local paper. The evening *news* insults their intelligence. They know that somewhere deep in the bowels of Washington there exists a hideous plan to bankrupt the country, tip the scales of justice in favor of criminals, and unconditionally surrender to the Russians. They don't need to be reminded of it.

But after the news they take their revenge. They seize the local paper. Take the police blotter for example. It is always the first piece of news read. Darby residents know all the names on the blotter except for the people from across the border in the neighboring state. Although they are concerned by the increase in serious crimes perpetrated primarily by people from the outside, they grin at the relatively minor offenses committed by the familiar names and silently respond to those by their own time-honored system of justice. After the police blotter, they look for some of the more pressing issues—the editorials and letters to the editor. In Darby, the older graduates of the local public high school honed their writing skills on these pages—on their favorite subject—public education.

Taking a Hard Look at Schools

It's a funny thing about Darby people, they have supported public education almost entirely with the property tax and are proud of it. Remember, New Hampshire has no broad based tax. It's kind of the 11th commandment here. Even with the local burden the schools are pretty good. College entrance exam scores are above the national average and high school bands march at Disney World just like the rest of the country. But here, more than in other parts of the nation, the people have always had a close link to their schools. They come

together once a year to vote on the following year's school budget. It's called the annual school district meeting. People frequently request that the budget be broken down line by line and item by item, sometimes to single out teachers' salaries. But for the most part, once the ritual is finished, the budget passes unscathed—that is until now.

Darby, like the rest of New Hampshire, has started to look at it's schools, just as the Japanese must have looked at the American auto industry ten years ago. People have started to talk about quality, productivity, and efficiency in education—terms that remain foreign and mystical to Darby's school management. In fact, there are some striking similarities between American public schools and the American auto industry of ten years ago.

After the 1973 oil embargo, American auto makers hit a new low. In 1974, the industry laid off more workers and lost more money than in anytime during its history. While the recession of '74 brought temporary hard times to the country, it ushered in a permanent decline in the auto industry from which it may take them many more years to recover. Hypnotized by profits, the industry failed to recognize that they were being swallowed by a tidal wave of quality Japanese imports.

Between 1965 and 1973, the total American market for cars grew by 25%, but the domestic manufacturers share grew by only 10%. Sales of fuel efficient imports rose by 122% in those same years. During this time Detroit continued to deliver passenger vehicles that would die before they got to the gas pump. Now for the second time in less than ten years the industry finds itself engaged in a struggle for its very survival. Detroit has gone to Japan to look for answers and they have found a not so mysterious orient—only their own mistakes.

Pitfalls of a "Short-Run" Mentality

American industry has a "short-run" mentality. The emphasis is on the annual stockholders report, the next *new* model (done as cheaply as possible), and the annual labor contract negotiations. G.M. made the Cadillac for three hundred dollars more than the Chevrolet but the sticker price was at least $3800 more—pure profit.[1] At the time, the management of G.M. must have laughed all the way to the bank, but little did they know. The incentive that drove them to the bank also drove the U.A.W. to record high wages, 22 paid holidays, and one of the worst production records in the history of the company. Sayonara.

If American education and industry are bound by the same forces then a comparison of American and Japanese industry might shed some

[1]"American Industry: What Ails it, How to Save it," James Fallows, pp. 35-50, ***The Atlantic,*** Sept. 1980.

creative light on our current domestic plight. There are many differences between American and Japanese industry. But the most striking is culture. Americans live for themselves, Japanese live for consensus through compromise (*nemawashi*, binding together of roots).[2] When important decisions are made, all of the people are involved. In Japanese industry, it simply means that everyone from the very top to the bottom becomes involved in planning and decision making. The process can be tedious, but in the end the whole group benefits because all members are aligned behind a common goal.

As compared to the short term profit incentive goals in the United States, Japanese industry uses long range goals that sometimes span fifteen or twenty years. Using consensus, they have employed technology to the fullest (and rendered our own industries helpless to compete) by developing automated machinery and the finest of quality control techniques. Through a "quality control circle," the Japanese workers seek new methods and strategies to improve quality and productivity. It is extremely important to note that change is viewed as positive and all changes are made within the context of the goal being pursued and the framework of the corporate philosophy.

Incentives for Productivity

Incentives, which encourage workers to use their own basic talents and abilities to focus on creative ways to achieve a goal, are an intrinsic part of the "quality control circle." Look briefly at a few of those incentives.

- ★ ***Loose-tight controls.*** *People need to know that their knowledge and abilities contribute to the accomplishment of the whole. Through the quality control circle workers are encouraged to try more effective methods and strategies (loose controls) in pursuit of the goals and within the context of the corporate philosophy (tight controls).*
- ★ ***Action oriented.*** *Workers need to see how their decisions make a difference. Through the "quality control circle" each person can see the result and impact of the groups' decision, for it is this group that is empowered to implement changes.*

In Japan, managers have created the incentives for a system which ensures that change is directed toward the goal being pursued and that quality is an integral part of the goal. Workers are expected to make quality control their top priority. Quality control awards are the most sought after incentives in the Japanese labor force.

And then there is the matter of competition, a reality better understood in the perspective of a country that has to import ninety percent of the

[2]"How Japan Does It," Christopher Byron, pp.54-60, ***Time,*** March 30, 1981.

natural resources it needs. Japan embodies competition. If a Japanese business can survive its own fiercely competitive market, it can survive anywhere.

Implications for Public Education

Enter public education. Even if Darby didn't know that a quality, fuel efficient, competitively priced automobile would save the auto industry, it certainly does know what is wrong with its system of education and it is beginning to fight back. Its system, complacent as a result of its dominant share of the "educational market," is on a collision course with a weakened economy. The prophetic citizenry have spoken. "Get fuel efficient with our money and get effective with our students." The budget was not passed this year in Darby.

The rejection of a single school district budget is not particularly noteworthy, but in the towns around Darby budgets are being rejected at a rate of three to one. People leave the meetings muttering about costs and yet, in the same breath, they criticize the management of their schools for a lack of discipline, low standards, and an unchallenged, unimaginative teaching staff. For a growing number, the property tax represents only a fraction of the money they spend to educate children. They have chosen to send their own children to private schools.

The private schools, sometimes facing almost insurmountable odds, cling to life with a tenacity just short of the New Hampshire black fly. Still they survive and flourish. Since 1975, New Hampshire public school enrollment has declined by nine percent, largely as the result of a decrease in the school age population. However, during this same time, the private schools have managed a quiet but persistent fifteen percent increase. Almost everyone has gotten into the act: fundamentalists, Lutherans, Catholics, elitists, and a new group that could simply be called "fed up."

Like the auto industry, there is little incentive for educators to notice or even think about the long range trends. They too have fallen prey to the complacency that has plagued other American institutions operating under the unfounded belief that this is a country of unlimited wealth. And although education may be the last to recognize the signs—dropping enrollments, failing budgets, and competition from a private sector—there were problems within the labyrinths of education that have been screaming for solutions. *The Condition of Education*, a statistical report published by the National Center of Education Statistics, cites public opinion polls that have remained relatively unchanged for the past ten years. At the top of the list is lack of discipline, followed by poor curriculum, lack of financial support, difficulty in getting good teachers, and parents'/students' lack of interest.

A Question of "Management"

If the public knows what is wrong with education, why does the management seem so hamstrung to do anything about it? The answer for education may be one that would bring a smile to the face of our foreign competition. It has to do with long range planning, trust, honesty, and subtlety.

Today it is called *Theory Z*, the title of a book by William Ouchi on how to meet the Japanese challenge. Darby knew about this theory years ago. It is somewhat forgotten now—they call it Yankee ingenuity.

Education at its highest levels suffers from the same opiate that the Japanese perceived in our auto industry ten years ago. This was long range planning, or rather the lack of it. The American educational system is plagued by excessive fragmentation. We tend to treat parts of the total as if they were separate and unrelated. Think about the various trends in education over the past two decades. Remember the "individualized-activity-oriented" approach, "modular scheduling," "open concept schools," and a host of other specialized methodologies? Working within our school systems we concentrate on differences, sub-characteristics, specialties, and authorities. In other words, we tend to tinker with pieces of a whole.

But there is another way. If the system of education could redefine its job or goal to focus on *results*, it could gain commitment for a purpose that could be understood and pursued by all. This purpose will never be understood by all until a structure is built which is based on incentives that promote trust, honesty, and subtlety.

To understand these concepts and their relationship to education requires another look at Japan. One of the most complex aspects of the Japanese management style is the relationship between planning, management, and work. It is also subtly simple. A worker in Japan is an extension of his company, community, and country as a whole. In the company, nothing gets done until consensus of all employees is achieved. Workers trust their managers because there is a sense that both labor and management are working toward the same goal within the same philosophy. We need to achieve the same relationship in U.S. schools that exists in Japanese industry—labor and management working toward the same purpose or goal.

The Corporate Philosophy in Education

Just like industry, education requires a philosophy that is a broad statement that puts into perspective the proper relationship of the business (student performance) to the employees (teachers), customers (students) and to the stockholders (public-at-large). "This general statement must be interpreted to have meaning for any specific situation and it is therefore important that managers be sufficiently

familiar with the underlying corporate culture so that they can interpret the philosophy in ways which produce cooperation rather than conflict."[3] Using the above criteria, the educational philosophy must include: (1) specific objectives easily interpreted by the employees; (2) a framework that outlines operating procedures; and (3) any constraints placed on the employee by the social and economic environment of the local community.

The Role of Manager in Education

As anyone in Darby will tell you, a clear statement of philosophy is nice, but without someone who has the skills to put the works into motion you might as well be on a sleek ship without a captain. The captains of quality in education are the key administrative staff responsible for implementation of a results-oriented plan which is carried out within the context of the operational philosophy.

So as not to slight other countries in the orient, a short poem from China exemplifies the kind of quality required of top management in education.

A good horse can be picked
by its general build and appearance.
But the mark of a superlative horse—
one that raises no dust
and leaves no tracks—
that mark is evanescent and fleeting,
as elusive as air.
Few eyes remark it.

Taoist Tale 350 BC
Fun-huang Caves
Western China

To find a successful manager you must care about the distinction. To make that distinction you must have an eye on the results that you require and on the ability of the manager to achieve the results. Frequently in management work is confused with activity—activity with no results. In the case of the superlative manager, there is a requirement to focus on key issues and maintain an ability to pursue those goals to their logical if not lengthy end. To keep a focus on key issues requires first of all a manager committed to people in order to gain their trust.

It is clear from numerous articles and research, that managers from any level of business, industry, or government require an adeptness in human skills. They must be sensitive to the dynamics of relating and at the same time willing to take risks. If the manager is truly committed to

[3]***Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge,*** William Ouchi, New York: Avon Books, 1982, p. 63.

clearly stated goals and has gained the trust of his employees then that will be reflected in the people who work around him. Hall has shown in his achieving manager research project that "subordinates definitely hear, and adopt as their own, their manager's motivational messages; managers create subordinates in their own images and the image differs as a function of the manager's level of achievement."[4]

Where It Counts: The Classroom Teacher

More money, often the solution to problems in America, will not increase productivity in education. The solution must begin on a level of trust that provides teachers with the incentives to concentrate their efforts, over the long run, for more productivity.

When a manager in education has established trust around goals, a new set of criteria will be reflected in the teacher.

1) *Teachers will want to know the relationship of other teachers to the performance of their own job. Therefore, teachers should be afforded the opportunity to teach at every level to give them a view of the large picture.*
2) *Teachers will know how clearly defined objectives fit within the framework of a long term plan.*
3) *Slowly, teachers and managers will want to measure how much educational gain is produced over a year and begin setting new levels of student performance.*
4) *Teachers will insist on incentives which challenge them to increase student performance.*

Teachers are the most important component of the organization—in fact, they are the organization. Nevertheless, they have often found themselves in an adversarial position with management—a position that creates extremes of bureaucracy, detailed rulemaking, and a general atmosphere of mistrust. The unintended consequence of this relationship is a loss of flexibility in the manner in which student performance is increased. "For a workable situation with the union or any industrial relations specialists, both management and employees must be convinced of the value of different incentives broader than just protecting and fighting one another—incentives to sustain a productive working relationship."[5] This is a challenge which both labor and management must accept.

"Putting Excellence into Management," an article in *Business Week* from July 21, 1980 reports the results of a study on managers from highly successful companies. They found that the outstanding performers work hard to keep things simple and that they rely on simple

[4]Shtogren, John A., Ed., ***Models for Management: The Structure of Competence***, Teleometrics, 1981, The Woodlands, Texas.

[5]***Theory Z***, p. 99.

organizational structures, simple strategies, simple goals, and simple communications. The eight attributes that characterize their management styles are as follows.

- ★ *A bias toward action*
- ★ *Simple form and lean staff*
- ★ *Continued contact with customers*
- ★ *Productivity improvement via people*
- ★ *Operational autonomy to encourage entrepreneurship*
- ★ *Stress on one key business value*
- ★ *Emphasis on doing what they know best*
- ★ *Simultaneous loose-tight controls*

It is management then that becomes critical to success or failure. We have lived in a time when management was not critical to the success of our goals. That time is nearing an end.

> *The monarch must be reclothed. Perhaps we have been the victims of an extended period of superstitious learning, which must now be unlearned. For more than two hundred years, our nation has surged forward under the momentum of the industrial revolution. If we take it as inevitable that the advent of factory production, of low-cost transportation and communication, and a few other innovations would bring a great increase in wealth in our nation, then the scene was set for superstitious learning. In essence, once these basic innovations were in place, our economy was destined to grow. No matter how well or how poorly we organized and managed our commercial enterprises, no matter what we did or failed to do, there would be growth, wealth, and success of an economic sort. In this setting, whatever beliefs developed about management were bound to be supported by success. Having "learned" how to manage successfully, we have continued to perfect this approach. Only now, when most of the benefit of these innovations has been exhausted, are we forced to see that our paradigm of management never did contribute anything to that success.*[6]

It should not take the example of a country on the rim of Asia to teach us that management with people—teamwork toward a common goal—can make this country's education great. If we as educators must learn this lesson, let us not forget it—the citizens of Darby haven't.

[6] ***Theory Z,*** pp. 187-188.